

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

|   |                     |                      | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                  |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE         | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.                   | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/695,826  | 10/30/2003          | Takayuki Saito       | 2003_1585A                            | 7179             |
| 513 75  | 90 09/29/2006       | EXAMINER             |                                       |                  |
|   | H, LIND & PONACK, I | MARKOFF, ALEXANDER   |                                       |                  |
| 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021 |                     |                      | ART UNIT                              | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |                     |                      | 1746                                  |                  |
|   |                     |                      | DATE MAILED: 09/29/2006               |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  |   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   | V           |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary  |   | 10/695,826  | SAITO ET AL.   |             |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |             |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | Alexander Markoff   | 1746   |             |  |  |  |  |
|  | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| WHIC<br>- Exte<br>after<br>- If NC<br>- Failu<br>Any   | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | N.<br>nely filed<br>the mailing date of this c<br>D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |             |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| 2a)  | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 July</u> This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E   | action is non-final.<br>nce except for formal matters, pro  |  | e merits is |  |  |  |  |
| Dispositi  | on of Claims  |   | ·  |             |  |  |  |  |
| 5) [<br>6) [<br>7) [   | Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) 1-17 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.  | vn from consideration.  |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| Applicati  | on Papers   |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| 10)  | The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction to oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine  | epted or b) objected to by the d<br>drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec<br>ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob  | e 37 CFR 1.85(a).<br>jected to. See 37 Cl                              |             |  |  |  |  |
| Priority ι   | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul> |   |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| 2)   | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  | 4)  | ite  |             |  |  |  |  |
| Pape   | r No(s)/Mail Date   | 6) [] Other:  |  |             |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/695,826 Page 2

Art Unit: 1746

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-8, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 134, subclass 109.
  - II. Claim 9, drawn to a method, classified in class 134, subclass 10.
  - III. Claims 10-13, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 134, subclass 137.
  - IV. Claim 14, drawn to a method, classified in class 134, subclass 34.
- V. Claims 15-17, drawn to a method, classified in class 134, subclass 33.

  The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
- 2. Inventions of Groups I and II and Groups III-V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects, because the inventions of Groups I and II require processing liquid being stationary, while the invention of Groups III-V require moving liquid with a specific velocity or in direction from a center of the substrate to the periphery.
- 3. Inventions of Group I and Group II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as

Art Unit: 1746

claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be use to practice a method without sucking the liquid.

- 4. Inventions of Groups IV and V and Group III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to practice different methods such the methods of Group IV or Group V.
- 5. Inventions of Group IV and Group V are directed to related methods. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have a materially different mode of operation. The invention of Group IV requires supplying cleaning liquid at a specific velocity. This is not required by the invention of Group V. The invention of Group V requires rotating the substrate, processing by a processing liquid and removal of the processing liquid. None of these is required by invention of Group IV Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Page 4

- Pecause these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 8. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Art Unit: 1746

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Markoff whose telephone number is 571-272-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alexander Markoff Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746

AM

ALEXANDER MARKOFF PRIMARY EXAMINER